

This paper is being transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office central fax number, 571 273-8300 on May 9, 2006

Receipt requested

PATENT

Attorney Docket
No. SB-20005

~~RECEIVED~~

CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY - 9 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: **Adam S. Landsman et al**

Serial Number: **10/781,424**

Filed: **February 18, 2004**

For: **MEDICAL PACK**

Art Unit **3738**

Examiner: **Thomas Barret**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Sir:

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed on February 10, 2006 having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire May 10, 2006.

The rejection of Claims 1 -13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen et al is respectfully traversed.

As an initial matter, each of the claims includes an element or step that is not disclosed by Allen et al, and as a result, this reference does not anticipate any of the claims in the application.

With respect to Claims 1-5, and contrary to the Examiner's suggestion, Allen et al does not disclose, or even suggest for that matter, the claimed step of returning the medical pack of Claim 1 to the physician. In the Office Action, the Examiner made reference to col. 2, lines 39-49 and col. 4, lines 26-39. The portion of Allen et al in col. 2, lines 39-49 makes no mention at all of returning a medical pack or kit to a physician, and the most pertinent portion of col. 4, lines 26-39 states in lines 35-38:

"The patient makes his or her regular visit of the physician as indicated, and indeed the instructions are such that most of the discussions can occur with a physician's assistant, freeing up physician time." (Emphases